

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

April 17, 2007

**Aldermen Osborne,
O'Neil, Shea, Roy, Long**

5:00 PM

**Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)**

Chairman Osborne called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Osborne, O'Neil, Shea, Roy and Long
Alderman Duval

Messrs.: B. Stanley, Deputy Chief Lussier, Lieutenant Hopkins, J. Hoben,
T. Arnold,

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

3. Chairman Osborne advises that the Parking Manager has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:
 - a) various requests to use parking lots for special events (see attached);
 - b) Lowell Street parking (discussion relating to recent "No Parking" ordinance requested by Alderman Duval;
 - c) Central High School parking (discussion relating to imposing an age/grade limited on students allowed to drive to school requested by Alderman Duval);
 - d) update on parking meter results for February and March 2007; and
 - e) update on Victory Garage management.

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated the first agenda item is a request to use various parking lots. There's two new requests. I'm sorry, there's two new requests at the Arms Lot, a new request for the Bedford Street and the Pearl Street lot, and a couple of date changes. I don't have any issues with any of these requests.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to approve this item.

Alderman Duval addressed items b) and c) of the Parking Manager's agenda:

Alderman Duval stated thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. At this time we can...I would request that the Committee give me the courtesy of a motion to table. We're trying to work out the differences in the area now after a change in the parking on lower Lowell Street. I think, in conjunction with the next item on your agenda, item c), ultimately we may come to a better resolve, but at least for now I'd request this matter be tabled.

Chairman Osborne asked b) and c) Mr. Duval?

Alderman Duval responded just b).

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to table this item.

Alderman Duval stated item c): What preceded my request for this item on the agenda this evening, through our new Parking Manager, Brandy Stanley, was the continual challenges that we have with regard to parking around Central High School. And as you can imagine, and I'm sure I get an empathetic ear from Aldermen who have high schools in their wards, but you can imagine that the number of vehicles in and around Central High School is so significant, and that demands that it places on surrounding homes, surrounding neighborhoods to the school is just monumental. And if it were just congestion perhaps we wouldn't be asking to address this condition in the manner I'm going to tonight. But, the climate out there has changed, and I think the incidents relating to high school students has changed dramatically since I was just in high school. And I can't imagine how much it's changed since Mr. Shea was in high school.

Alderman Shea stated as when you were in high school. No different.

Alderman Duval stated I remember back in my high school days a lot of high school students shared vehicles, if we drove at all. Most of us walked. The impact was terribly less significant than it is today, I imagine. But also, neighbors put up with abuse by students, unfortunately. They have to put up with kids dumping refuse out their vehicles in their front yards and blocking the driveways, and music blaring and smoking cigarettes and bottles being thrown. The list goes on and on and on. It is unbelievably a negative impact in and around the school area. Something has to be done. What I'm asking the Committee tonight to consider, and what I've asked Ms. Stanley to assist me with is to try to determine

if the City is now ready to take a real serious look, hard look, at restricting the amount of vehicles that students take to school. I know Betsi DeVries has had a conversation with Ms. Stanley and I've asked her to check into what other municipalities are doing in and around our State to address the negative impact on the volume of student vehicles that are brought to high schools. Interestingly, the evidence, although minimal at this point, is pretty interesting. What I'd ask the Committee to do is to request that the Mayor appoint, if it's appropriate, and I'd refer to veteran Aldermen to maybe help me with this, but to form a committee comprised of the Aldermen that have high schools in their wards – I believe that would be four, eight and eleven – and to work with Ms. Stanley over the next 30 days and report back to your Committee, and then the full Board on the findings. We're basically trying to get our arms around trying to limit the impact of the volume of vehicles in and around our City high schools.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Duval, didn't you have one thing in the back of your mind about juniors and seniors only?

Alderman Duval responded that's correct, but before I...

Chairman Osborne stated let me ask that one question before you go on. Mr. Arnold, would that be discriminating if we just made it juniors and seniors taking cars to school. I'm sure he's going to say no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated I would have to research and consider that. I think that I might have a problem with the basic concept of saying students can't drive a car or park it in a certain area. That will take some research.

Alderman Shea raised a point of order. Wouldn't you think it's appropriate that the people from the School Department be involved with your committee, or at least be part of it because it would probably be a School District decision as far as who would take a car and who wouldn't? I mean, it isn't up maybe to us. That would be the policy that I would think would do that, if they so wish. Now, if you form the committee and the committee that you formed had one proposition and it was rejected at the School District because of whatever reason, naturally it would then result in a non-sequitur kind of situation. But if you involve them and try to work with them in terms of a committee that would be a School District committee decision and you'd probably have more...

Alderman Duval stated Alderman Shea raises a very good point. It's kind of interesting. As this discussion has evolved between myself and Ms. Stanley, my first thought was to ask for the committee to be formed in cooperation with or conjunction with members of the Board of School Committee, as a means to come a solution that would be agreeable between the City and the School District. After

giving it further thought, and I'm going to ask Ms. Stanley to jump in here, she pointed out to me that it's a City decision, it's a municipal decision and not a School District decision because the City controls what goes on on our City streets, not the School District. Now, as a courtesy, at some point, I think we should possibly involve, as this discussion ensues, to ask for participation and cooperation from the School District, so we would act in a politically correct way. We certainly wouldn't want to put anyone out, and we certainly want to build consensus and cooperation as we move forward. But I think Ms. Stanley sort of brought that to my attention. That kind of makes sense. We are the ones that institute and change ordinances routinely, and if we're going to address the problem, the buck is going to stop here, really. We can't defer to the School District. It probably will never be addressed because they don't have the same agenda we have. Their agenda is to pacify students. Ours is to make sure that our City streets and neighborhoods are safe, and the residents are satisfied.

Chairman Osborne stated if it was just junior and seniors, then of course we have no way of policing that. The police force here wouldn't have any ways of policing who's who and what year they're in, unless you had stickers on the cars or something like that.

Alderman Duval stated I don't want to get too far ahead of the curve and too far ahead in this discussion because I think that's what we want to get together to do, is to try come up with some solutions...

Chairman Osborne stated we don't want to put too many ideas into it right now, right?

Alderman Duval stated maybe Ms. Stanley can jump in and comment as well.

Alderman Shea stated may I add that if, in fact, you needed the cooperation of the School District, and you didn't involve them, and you needed stickers for our juniors and seniors to receive some sort of authorization, and they weren't involved in the scenario in terms of planning and so forth, then you would find probably a little bit of maybe less cooperation. I don't know...I'm just saying, you definitely need the School Department's cooperation. There's no question about it. Whether we control traffic or whether we don't, we still need their cooperation. There's no question in my mind.

Alderman Long stated it's the School District's responsibility to...it would be on them to say which students will be taking their cars and which won't. We wouldn't have that, although we take care of our streets. If this affects the School District, they're the ones that would make a decision as to their policy with respect to students that could bring cars or not.

Alderman Duval stated again, Alderman Long, I think what is important is that once we start this process we may conclude that that's the case. And I'm not sure it is the case. I'm not sure because if we, if this Board, institutes an ordinance, then their students are going to have to comply or they're going to get ticketed. If we institute, for instance, a radius around a high school, that has to be Resident Only parking...let's assume that's a solution for a minute. And if you don't have a permit on your car, you're going to get ticketed. It has to be black on white, and I think the problem right now is that it's so convoluted, our Police Department is being asked to do what's basically impossible. It's putting an unfair burden, I think, on police officers to be called by residents, and it's putting an unfair burden on homeowners who have to call the police every time a car is parked illegally in front of their property. The ultimate goal, I think, is going to be probably restricting it to residential parking areas, so these residents can have their neighborhoods back. It's interesting...just quickly...I look at Merrimack. They have onsite parking for 400 vehicles; they issue permits for \$50 per school year, to seniors and juniors. They charge the students, juniors and seniors, to park. Goffstown is for seniors only, by permit on site. No on street parking in the areas is allowed. This was changed, by the way, from what they had years ago and is strictly enforced by the Police Department. It created such huge problems with residents and business owners that it was ultimately banned. Fees are not currently charged but will probably be instituted in the near future, due to increasing demand. Other districts are facing the same challenge as we are, but they're doing something about it, and we're failing to do anything about it and that's the whole crux of the story. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like Ms. Stanley to jump in at some point to comment as well.

Chairman Osborne asked when you said one town was charging them, was that on a public street?

Alderman Duval responded that's correct.

Chairman Osborne asked how do they do that one? I can't imagine the School Department charging money to park on a public street.

Alderman Duval stated we do it now. We lease out spaces on public streets.

Chairman Osborne stated I know, but you're saying the School Department's doing this, charging the kids.

Alderman Duval stated you're confusing the two; it's still a City street.

Ms. Stanley stated if I may, Aldermen, the \$50 permit charges for on street parking at that particular school, most of the...three of the four schools had on site parking, but either they had limited on site parking or there were no other parking options within walking distance of the school. Goffstown is the one that is probably the most similar to Manchester, and they have just flat out told their students that they cannot park on the street at all. So the only students that drive are seniors that are issued permits, and they park on site. There are probably many different options for controlling the parking within the high school system in the City of Manchester. I agree with Alderman Duval, trying to get ahead of ourselves and figuring out exactly how it's going to work right now might be a little bit premature because there are many school systems we haven't heard from, and there's probably many different ways of figuring it out.

Chairman Osborne stated but the monies would come back to the City; it wouldn't go to the school, if they're charging permit fees out on the public street.

Ms. Stanley stated that would be something that we would need to figure out, but if we did indeed charge a fee to park on a public street, I would imagine it would come back to the City.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we need to move very cautiously. To the best of my knowledge, we are not going to find another situation – maybe Concord High School – I officiate sports so I go to most of these high schools in the State – where there is on site parking required. Just about 90% of the schools have on site parking, including...which is the one you quoted that does charges on street? Merrimack. You need to look at the situation in Merrimack. The Main Street end is exclusive to the school district. Now it may be a City street, but it's exclusive to the school district. It comes right off...I don't know what the road is, but opposite the police station and goes back a quarter of a mile, something like that. But it's exclusive. There's a number of schools there. And I think even coming back around, the majority of that street is school district, so we need to be very cautious with this. What we need to look at are cities like Lowell that has a downtown high school, and that, and not be comparing it to...because I don't think there is another...possibly Concord High...and I really don't know what they have for parking on site. Every other high school that I can think of has on site parking. They may charge a fee for it, but they have on site parking, not on street. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I just caution with that. I represented Ward 4, Alderman Duval, as you do now. I know the challenges. I know Alderman Thibault and the challenges he has with West. Memorial, it's actually scary to drive by there and see the amount of cars in that parking lot. I would suggest earlier than later, to include the School District in these discussions. You have to.

Chairman Osborne stated there's no doubt about it.

Alderman Shea stated I think at this time...you could check, but I think Memorial does charge a fee to park in the Memorial parking lot. I'm pretty sure, and it goes to Mr. Adamakos's account over there. I'm almost certain that they pay \$25 to park at Memorial within the parking lot and that money is used. You could check though, with that. I just wanted to mention that, that already...so schools in Manchester may...

Chairman Osborne asked so Alderman Duval, can we put the committee together here? Can you give us the names for the Wards that you want?

Alderman Duval stated Mr. Chairman, and again, if I might, I fully embrace the thought process of Alderman O'Neil. It's a very slow and methodical process. All I'm saying is that this is purely initiation. We have to at least begin to respond to some of the concerns that have been expressed, not only by the residents of abutting Central High School, which is quite massive now, in terms of the radius around the school, but also the other high schools. And this is one way to do it. I think slow, methodical. What we intend, what I have in mind, I think to start off with at least the first pass, very preliminary, find out what exactly what the City can do and what it's position might be, and report back to the Committee, and then include School Board representatives, or ask the School District to respond by naming...you can't tell them what to do...you can't tell them what to do, but basically asking for their cooperation and working with us to address the issue. But I think, as we get more information, it's appropriate.

Chairman Osborne asked can we put a committee together here and then we can discuss it a little bit?

Alderman O'Neil stated I just had a question for Alderman Duval. Do you know if the administration at Central has informed the students that there's a probability that no parking is going to be allowed at the Ash Street School, come September? That discussion has gone on between the school and the students?

Alderman Duval responded I'm not sure about between the school and the students. I would guess it...well there was a general announcement, I know that. There was a public announcement. But in terms of what the school principal has done...

Alderman O'Neil stated that's just going to take a tough situation and make it worse.

Alderman Duval stated absolutely.

Alderman Shea stated one of the problems that parents do have is the fact that buses do not run. So basically, not to be included in the committee necessarily, but to give credence to the fact that maybe MTA, the Manchester Transportation Association, can provide transportation for people who may not be part of being able to bring their car to school. I'm not saying at what stage they should be included, but they should definitely be part of it because that might help out in terms of, you know, you're not allowed to bring your car to school, but yet transportation would be available to those students that now it's not provided to.

Ms. Carol Johnson, Deputy City Clerk, stated my understanding is that Alderman Duval is requesting that there be three Board members on this committee, and actually it would constitute a special committee of the Board, so that if the committee wanted to proceed, it would be recommended that a special committee of the Board be established, and that would go out as a report to the full Board. The Chairman would actually chose the chairman of the committee and then two others would be appointed, or however many you want to sit on...

Chairman Osborne asked do we need five members, Carol, or three? I know three is a quorum in the Committee, but do you need five on this, or three?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated three. Three members is a special committee, unless otherwise ordered. You can increase it, but it has to be three members, at least.

Alderman O'Neil asked would it be the intent of this Committee, in making that recommendation, that Alderman Duval will represent Central High School, Alderman Thibault will represent West, and I'm not sure...I know, Alderman Shea, you and Alderman DeVries, your dividing line is down there someplace.

Alderman Duval stated I think it's eight.

Chairman Osborne stated it's in her Ward.

Alderman O'Neil stated that we, at least the three Aldermen that have the high schools in their districts be represented. I'm not trying to cut Alderman Shea out of something, but...

Alderman Shea stated but you're not doing that. It's in her...What I'm trying to mention to you, doesn't special committees, Carol, be appointed by the Chairman of the Board?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that's correct, but the committee is established by the full Board, and then the Chairman of the Board chooses the chairman of the

committee. The chairman of the committee chooses the membership, but this doesn't prohibit this Committee from saying, we are suggesting that the three members consist of the three Aldermen that have high schools in their districts.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to recommend to the full Board that a special committee be established to consider various restrictions on students driving to the three Manchester public high schools. In addition, the motion recommends that the three Aldermen who have these high schools in their districts be chosen to serve on the special committee.

Ms. Stanley stated an update on the parking meter results. I have this month to report February and March numbers from the Pay & Display installations. In February the increase over the previous six month average was 53%. In March it was 79% increases in revenue. I am happy to report that our credit card fees are down from 35% of credit card revenue, all the way down to 22%, and we're working on lowering that further. So that's definitely helpful. Our single space revenues were down...

Alderman Shea asked 53% of what number? You know, 53% of ten dollars is kind of different than 53% of...

Ms. Stanley responded our previous six month...the average for the Pay & Display district for the previous six months was \$59,000 a month. I apologize. It's \$24,000 a month. \$59,000 is the total, and our revenues for the Pay & Displays in February were \$36,000. So that constitutes a 53% increase over the \$24,000 average.

Alderman Shea stated so in February it was last year \$24,000. This year it's \$36,000 in February and in March it was how much last year?

Ms. Stanley stated Alderman, that \$24,000 is an average of the six months previous to the installation of the parking meters, so it wasn't the number from the year before. We didn't have enough information to be able to pull that. All I could pull was the six month average previous to when we installed the meters.

Alderman Shea stated so the six month average was \$24,000 in both February and March, okay. And then February you took in \$36,000 and in March you took in \$59,000.

Ms. Stanley stated that was \$42,784. Forget the \$59,000. I apologize. In March we collected \$42,784.

Alderman Roy asked Brandy, is it possible that...I'm not sure how much technology you have in your office. I'll make the request that you work with Finance or if you can do it yourself, you put together an Excel spreadsheet that we can get on a monthly basis, updating to this Committee and/or the committees on Administration or Accounts, just so that everyone can see what the progress is, what the fees are. You seem to be answering a lot of these questions for a lot of different Aldermen, a lot of different committees. So, something could be formulated that just gets updated on a regular basis, as well as gives us a historical track for three, four, five, ten years out. We can look back and see where we were today. Guy in Finance is fantastic at providing these spreadsheets when I need different information, but the more information you can get us, the better.

Ms. Stanley stated Alderman, I already have that. I haven't sent it out because it's got so much information. When I'm presenting it, I try to boil it down to the most relevant figures, but I'd be more than happy to send that out on a monthly basis.

Alderman Roy stated that would be fantastic.

Chairman Osborne stated okay, we don't need anything on that one. Go to e).

Ms. Stanley stated final is the update on the Victory Garage management that was approved by the full Board. The City will take possession of the garage on Tuesday, May 1st, exactly two weeks from today. The job class specifications that are in the HR Committee still have to be approved, and that should be done this evening from 6:00 to 6:15. And we're going to ask the committee to refer that to the full Board this evening, with the request to suspend the rules because we don't have enough time to send it back to Bills on Second Reading in order to get it ready for May 1st. All of the employees at the garage have opted to live under the City's employment, which is very, very good news. Just today we sent out the billing for the garage for May. We successfully had a transfer of information from Central Parking and sent out the bills. Info Systems will have the connectivity to the garage for our computers and Internet access by the end of the week. The PCO's have made the transfer as of April 1st and are now working out of the Victory Garage. We'll be moving out of the Traffic Department office on Monday, April 30th, and we should be up and ready for business on May 1st in the garage.

Alderman Roy stated Brandy, the PCO's, and I think we've addressed this a little bit in the past, but I just want it real crystal clear because of an incident that happened last week. The PCO's, when they are on the street, have direct communication to dispatch?

Ms. Stanley responded yes. They still carry the police radios and they have a channel that goes directly to the Police Dispatch.

Alderman Roy stated okay, and then in your office you'll also have a channel to communicate with them?

Ms. Stanley responded I don't have a police radio but I do have radio contact with them, yes.

Alderman Roy asked okay, you do have that ability to do that without interfering with Police?

Ms. Stanley responded yes.

Alderman Roy stated if the PCO needs it, they have direct access.

Ms. Stanley stated and that's exactly what happened when the incident happened last week.

Alderman Shea asked Brandy, when you move out of the Traffic Department, is anyone going to be left there or is that going to be vacant?

Ms. Stanley responded the Traffic Division will still be there.

Alderman Shea stated okay, so in case we need to call Mr. Hoben, we could still call that number, 624-6580.

Ms. Stanley stated yes, we're actually taking that number with us, but we will have the ability to transfer it over to the Traffic Department office.

Alderman Shea asked that will be your number?

Ms. Stanley responded yes.

Alderman Shea stated so number three will be him, okay, same as it is. Thanks.

Chairman Osborne stated okay, Brandy, if you want to sit there for a few more minutes just in case.

Alderman O'Neil stated quick question, Mr. Chairman, for Deputy Lussier or Lieutenant Hopkins. Can we get, at some point, not necessarily tonight, an update on what happened last week? Thank you. Send it to our homes, and that. We'd appreciate it. Thank you.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

4. Petitions submitted by residents of Grove Street requesting change in the use of Grove Street between Wilson and Hall Streets.
(*Note: Building Commissioner's comments enclosed.*)

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated and we would note, Mr. Chairman, that the actual request is for private parking in front of their properties. The Building Commissioner's report is indicating that it might be consistent with residential parking zone.

Chairman Osborne stated this is in my Ward, and it runs from Wilson to Hall Street on Grove. Have any of the Committee read this at all? Do you have any questions or anything?

Alderman O'Neil asked is the intent...What I read, and maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong, is to get rid of the trucks parking. Is that correct?

Chairman Osborne responded I've been on this now for a year and a half, with the school buses over there, and the trailer truck and flatbed, and so on and so forth. I guess the buses park all the time on Grove Street, which blocks them from getting out of their driveways sometimes, or backing out of their driveway. The thing is, they're legal as long as they weigh less than 10,000 pounds. These buses, they are legal, and they can park on the street. So there's not too much you can do about it unless it's over 10,000 pounds, I guess, from what I got from the Building Department. But they're still working on it. I think what we have here is a Pandora's box. Again, you cannot have private parking in front of your home. It's just opening up a can of worms, like I said a few months ago. I think it can be remedied without going through all of this permit parking or residential parking. So I have the recommendation of receiving and filing, but go ahead.

Alderman O'Neil asked where do these buses come from?

Chairman Osborne responded they're out of Londonderry if I remember right. I called myself once or twice, and I have all the literature on it at home.

Alderman O'Neil asked and the bus company didn't respond?

Chairman Osborne responded well, they seemed to and then, I guess the ones who are driving the buses are just putting it aside a little bit and taking advantage of it. I don't know. It's becoming a little bit of a problem. But I think it will be remedied sooner or later.

Alderman O'Neil asked and what about the other trucking companies?

Chairman Osborne responded this one that parks on the side of the building... That flatbed is not really the big problem. That's an on-property problem. But the others, the school buses, are on the street. So that's the one that's causing the problem. Instead of parking on Wilson Street, they're parking on Grove Street and making it a little hard for the people on Grove Street, that's all. I think eventually it will be settled.

Alderman Shea asked do these people that live there drive the bus or do they park there during the day?

Chairman Osborne responded they live there. They live on the corner of Wilson and Grove.

Alderman Shea stated okay, that person lives there but drives the bus for the Londonderry district.

Chairman Osborne stated there's a few of them there. There's probably like three and four buses sometimes.

Alderman Shea stated so there's more than one people there.

Chairman Osborne stated there's more than one driver that lives it that home, evidently.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm just curious, Mr. Chairman, how does the ordinance... There's some ordinance about commercial vehicles. That doesn't count in this particular case?

Chairman Osborne responded like I said, it's the weight of the vehicle. As long as it's under 10,000 pounds.

Alderman O'Neil stated Lieutenant Hopkins, can we have him come up for a second?

Chairman Osborne responded sure.

Alderman O'Neil stated because there's been issues over the years with plumbers parking out in front of...

Alderman Shea stated yes, they have to park in the driveway. Once there's a label on your truck, you have to park in the driveway.

Alderman O'Neil stated we know the Lieutenant is well-voiced in these matters. John, isn't there some ordinance that over the years has been used when necessary... I don't think it's something you're out looking for... regarding commercial vehicles parking on a City street?

Lieutenant John Hopkins responded the only one I'm aware of is for night, overnight.

Alderman O'Neil asked does it have something to do with...Alderman Shea said something about the marking on the truck. Is that relevant to this, or am I thinking of another ordinance?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded I think you're thinking of the one that covers parking overnight, overnight parking for commercial vehicles. There was an issue with vans and trucks at one time, and I think it was discussed that if they had lettering, company lettering on it, we'd consider it a commercial vehicle.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that related to winter parking, or nothing to do with it?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded it's separate. It's for all year.

Alderman O'Neil asked wouldn't these buses, being private entities with markings on it, wouldn't they fall under that same ordinance?

Lieutenant Hopkins stated they're parked there during the daytime.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Osborne is saying...

Chairman Osborne stated yes, they are. They park one on one side and one on the other side on Wilson Street. They're there at night.

Lieutenant Hopkins asked at nighttime? Because I talked to this man, and my understanding is that they're parked there during the day.

Chairman Osborne stated but they also park on their own property at nighttime, which would be the Building Department's...

Lieutenant Hopkins stated but the buses aren't there.

Chairman Osborne stated yes they are, sir.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated oh they're there at night?

Chairman Osborne stated that's right.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated the gentleman I spoke to that called me, the one that sent the petition in, only said that they were during the daytime.

Chairman Osborne stated I go by there about 60 times a day, so I know I see what I see there, even in the evening.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that something, Mr. Chairman, that Lieutenant Hopkins could look into?

Chairman Osborne stated there's a bus that parks on the Wilson Street side between...actually they park too close to the buildings. There's a bus that parks on the Wilson Street side with a long trailer bed right in back of it almost every night.

Lieutenant Hopkins asked next to the building?

Chairman Osborne stated next to the building.

Lieutenant Hopkins asked it's on their property though, right?

Chairman Osborne stated yes, it's on their property. That's why I say it's the Building Department.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated this covers the street.

Chairman Osborne stated it's not on the street.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated this is overnight parking, so we would have to be there after midnight.

Alderman O'Neil asked Mr. Chairman, they're not parking on the street overnight? They put three or four buses in their own yard?

Chairman Osborne stated I've seen as many as four buses, three on one side on one side of Grove Street and one around the other side on Wilson.

Alderman O'Neil asked and they can get them all on their property?

Chairman Osborne replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know you said you've got Building working on it, and maybe Lieutenant Hopkins could have somebody just take a look at it.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to receive and file this petition.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Gregory and Barbara Ahlgren requesting rescission of "No Parking" zone in front of 338 Walnut Hill Avenue Extension.
(Note: Public Works Director's recommending to follow long-standing City practice of addressing a parking issue by restricting parking on the north side of the street in front of 338 Walnut Hill Avenue.)

Chairman Osborne stated this is going to be tabled. Right, Mr. Roy? This will be tabled till the next meeting.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk would just note that it is a communication regarding 338 Walnut Hill Avenue, and there is a handout that we did distribute from Mr. Tenn as well. He was unable to make the meeting, so we wanted to make sure you were aware that was there.

Alderman Roy stated if I could just ask, with tabling, that we add the information we received tonight to the package and go ahead and table it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just wish these parties would get together.

Alderman Roy stated it's getting closer.

Chairman Osborne stated it's all up to Mr. Roy.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to add the information received this evening to the package.

6. Communication from Barry Sullivan requesting approximately 12 residential parking permits for a 6-tenement building located at 159 Douglas Street and seeking authorization to allow overnight parking in the Senior Center parking lot.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'll move to deny the request. This will start a whole snowball effect.

Chairman Osborne stated we've been saying that for years.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Aldermen Shea, it was voted to deny this request.

7. E-mail communication from Jennifer Drakoulakos expressing her concerns regarding traffic flow and parking problem on A Street.

Chairman Osborne stated Mr. Thibault is not present, I don't believe.

Alderman Shea stated I recommend we table it.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked did you want to ask the Police Department to look at it? I don't know if they have.

Chairman Osborne stated could I ask, does anyone from the Police Department know about this at the present?

Lieutenant Hopkins stated we've already started to work on this with Alderman Smith. We had a meeting with Ms. Drakoulakos, myself, Jim Hoben, Sargent Bartlett and Alderman Smith. We met with her in the Visiting Nurses association, which is part of the problem with their parking. I would come up with a plan, and I've been working on it all. Part of it involves enforcement of the thirty minute zone next to the school, which Ms. Stanley's mobile piece was helping us out with, and also some signs. We'd like to put the traffic counter out to get a good assessment of the speed on the street. But, unfortunately because of the snow, we can't put it out because we don't want it to get hit with the snowplow. So we'll have to wait for a little bit better weather to get it out on the street. As far as the speed down the street that she complained about goes, my feeling was that may be a perception problem, and not such a speed problem. It's a thirty mile per hour zone, it's a narrow street. Cars coming down that street would appear to her, or to people in the neighborhood, to be going much faster than they actually are. That's why I want to the traffic counter out there before we make any decisions on that. And if we have a problem there, we will certainly address it.

Chairman Osborne asked can we go by your recommendation with the thirty minutes, for the time being – the thirty minutes – you said you were going to have a limit thirty minutes on the school side, was it?

Lieutenant Hopkins stated the zone is already posted for the thirty-minute zone. Ms. Stanley's mobile PCO is helping us by monitoring that for us, to make sure that the cars move when they're supposed to. So we're already working on this project; if you'd like to table it, that's fine.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to table this item.

8. Traffic Division agenda and addendum:

Stop Signs (Emergency Ordinances):

On Lake Shore Road at Island Pond Road, NWC
Alderman Pinard

On River Front Drive Extension at River Front Drive, SEC
Alderman Forest

4-Way Stop Signs:

On North Street at Oak Street, NEW, SCW (School Zone)
Alderman Gatsas

On Bodwell Road at Sunset Pine Drive, SWC
On Bodwell Road at Cohas Avenue, NEC
Alderman Pinard

On Howe Street at Lincoln Street, NEC, SWC
Alderman Shea

No Parking Anytime:

On Frederick Street, north side, from a point 20 feet east of Hale Street
(western section) to a point 70 feet west of Hale Street (western section)
Alderman Smith

On Montcalm Street, south side, from Dionne Drive to a point 120 feet east
Alderman Thibault

No Parking Anytime (Emergency Ordinances):

On Norris Street, east side, from a point 100 feet north of Somerville Street
to a

point 90 feet northerly

On Prout Avenue, east side, from the dead end to a point 50 feet northerly
Alderman Shea

On River Front Drive, south side, from the west property line of 155 River
Front

Drive easterly to River Front Drive Extension

Alderman Forest

No Parking During School Hours:

On Lois Street, west side, from a point 40 feet north of Jeanine Street to a
point 100 feet north of Weston Road

On Lois Street, east side, from a point 100 feet north of Weston Road to Jeanine Street
Alderman DeVries

Rescind Yield Signs (Emergency Ordinances):

On Lake Shore Road at Island Pond Road, NWC (Ord. #7978)
On Lake Shore Road at Island Pond Road, NWC (Ord. #7986 - duplicate on record)
Alderman Pinard

Rescind Stop Signs (Emergency Ordinances):

On River Front Drive at River Front Drive Extension, SWC
On River Front Drive, at River Front Drive Extension, NWC
Alderman Forest

Flashing Signals:

On Massabesic Street and Cypress Street
Alderman Osborne
(Note: referred back to Committee by BMA on April 3, 2007.)

No Parking Anytime:

On Sarto Street, west side, from Candia Road, southerly to the beginning of the turnaround
Alderman Pinard

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm not doing this to stir the pot, but this came up not too long ago.

Chairman Osborne stated the flashing signal is not on this one.

Alderman O'Neil stated no, no. I'm jumping in on that pot when we get there. Do we or do we not have a policy regarding four-way stop signs? Are they supposed to be in school zones?

Chairman Osborne responded if you're asking me, here's my answer. I have no problem with four way stop signs at school areas, playgrounds, or elderly. Those are the three things that I really have no problem with, because in some sections, even with the elderly, they take a long time to cross the streets. Like I had one up on Belmont and Hall, excuse me, Belmont and Summer not too long ago. They take a long time sometimes, with their walkers and so on and so forth, so in that area an elderly situation is just as important as a school zone.

Alderman O'Neil asked if he could ask a question of Alderman Shea. Is that location Hall Park, Alderman Shea?

Alderman Shea responded that's right.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand that. I think that's a good policy. The ones above Bodwell Road, I'm not sure it would meet any of those street criterias.

Chairman Osborne stated well Mr. Pinard was...I saw him here a minute ago. Maybe he's in the Mayor's office. I mean, I don't want to speak for him.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm personally not a fan of four-ways, but I like if the policy is school zones, areas where the elderly reside, or playground areas. I'm okay with that. I just don't...I'm glad Alderman Shea clarified this.

Chairman Osborne stated I just brought all this up. Before it was just school zones, and I say it should be broadened a little bit, depending on the situation here. The elderly and the children are just as vulnerable to anything else. That's why I just brought it up that way.

Alderman O'Neil stated we're going to stop traffic on Bodwell Road? Mr. Chairman, Lieutenant Hopkins seems to have some knowledge.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Hoben, will you see if Mr. Pinard is in the Mayor's office? I'd like to get this over with.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated this has been an ongoing thing for some time. Southern New Hampshire planning did a survey out there to see if the intersection warranted a traffic light. They found that it didn't. I'm not a big fan of four-way stop signs either, but usually when I research these intersections for accidents, I find a lot of fender benders, not as many personal injury accidents. This intersection is a little bit different from that. We've had some serious personal injury accidents; speed has always been a big problem on Bodwell Road. We've been out there running radar as much as possible. Covering this road, we just can't seem to change the behavior of people that live on that road. I don't understand what it is or why they drive like that; speed is definitely an issue. A four-way stop sign might be the most economical and cheapest way, other than a road change design, to maybe give some relief to the people who live out there, and to help us out. And usually, I have to say, I wouldn't favor it, but I've been out there and looked at the intersection. It already has a flashing yellow light, which I think should be changed to red, and a stop sign installed, only to try it out, because we need to do something.

Alderman O'Neil stated John, we're not using four-ways to control speed.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated no. We're trying to make a change in the roadway that's cheap and economical. It may help us address a speed problem and a traffic problem out there.

Alderman O'Neil stated because I know anytime we do these little fixes, they speed between the fixes. It doesn't really slow anything down.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated I'm hoping that this helps out.

Alderman O'Neil stated all right, so this does not, I just want to make sure, you're recommending this because of other factors other than speed.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated right. I'm recommending this because of the accidents.

Alderman Shea asked would a red light or, you know, be better at that particular juncture than a four-way stop sign, other than the cost? Now we're not talking about the cost. The practical sense. Would a...

Lieutenant Hopkins stated Southern New Hampshire Planning did their study out there just recently and said a traffic light is not warranted at that intersection. I'm not quite sure what factors they look at. What I'm looking at is the number of accidents.

Alderman Shea asked did they feel that a traffic light was warranted?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded no. They don't. They don't want one.

Alderman Shea stated it's not warranted. Okay.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated and I'm just looking at the number of accidents and possibly a way of stopping some of those, especially injury ones.

Alderman Shea stated thank you.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to approve the Traffic Department agenda.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Mr. Chairman, could we just clarify because the Lieutenant mentioned a flashing red light at that location, so my presumption is we're looking to change it from a flashing yellow to a flashing red.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated that's been suggested. There are flashing lights already at that intersection. It flashes yellow so we'd change the lens to red.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated change the lens to red; so that would require a separate action of the Committee.

Chairman Osborne asked does that have four already, or just two, the yellow blinker?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded you've got me on that one. I know it's Bodwell; I don't know if it's a four-way.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Hoben, just quickly, is there four or two there? Does it have to be changed, the whole thing? Okay, you're all set.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to change the flashing light from yellow to red.

9. **Flashing Signals:**

On Massabesic Street and Cypress Street

Alderman Osborne

(Note: referred back to Committee by BMA on April 3, 2007.)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve this item.

10. Pedestrian Crosswalks Traffic Policy.

Alderman Roy stated I thought we dealt with this at our last meeting when we established what crosswalks will look like, the hash marks, which you used very nicely on Massabesic Street. We solved some problems there.

Chairman Osborne asked, Mr. Hoben, are we all set with this, on the crosswalks?

Alderman Long asked you're okay with the policy?

Chairman Osborne asked isn't there a couple different ones here, though? You know, you want the wide ones, don't you? There's twelve-inch and there's eight-inch. I guess they're for different reasons, Mr. Hoben?

Mr. Hoben stated yes, we're trying to bring some standardization to our operation, and it's a request of the Committee that they wanted the hash marks. Several months ago you issued a directive that said that each crosswalk would be hash marked. We found it was to be virtually 'mission impossible' to complete it. It's time consuming and the volume of paint that would be used. So basically I designed this policy so that we'd use the ones that are uncontrolled, using the hash marks on the side streets, we'd use the six-inch, Type II. The Type I you'd see on Elm Street, north of Bridge and all the downtown areas and the school zones, which is uncontrolled. The one with the stop signs, out of the school zones and out of downtown area, would be the six-inch.

Chairman Osborne stated but Jim, could we also use the twelve-inches in the park areas and the elderly as well, like we're talking about schools, I mean, if we have the time? Is that possible? That would be the next step, right? We go to the schools right now. If you have the manpower and the paint and everything else, then we could go to the elderly, let's say, and then parks.

Mr. Hoben stated each street would be hash marked if it's not controlled by a stop sign.

Chairman Osborne stated yes, exactly. But we want the wide hash marks in the playground area, is what I'm saying.

Alderman Roy stated I spent a lot of time going through this discussion with crosswalks, and I know Jim and I agree in principal on what they're supposed to do but disagree when it comes to how we should be spending our dollars. I would ask that we...I thought that this was just a re-hashing of the pedestrian stop walk sign policy, which it's not. I would ask that we receive and file this, and stay within our previous discussion that we have Type I crosswalks throughout the City. We're a City that needs to, as Alderman O'Neil just said, we put signs in places; there's a lot of inconsistency. We need to train the people driving in our City, whether they're here for the first day or they've been here for their entire life, that this is a crosswalk in the City of Manchester and it's a State law to stop for pedestrians. If we have one type on quiet, residential streets and another type on South Willow Street and another type on Elm Street, it's not going to work. I'd much rather work with Jim and the Highway Department to come up with an efficient way to line our crosswalks, use of paint and manpower, which can be done through purchasing equipment, and go that route than have one pedestrian in the City hit while we're sitting here. So I would ask that we stay with our previous discussion or decision, stay with the Type I crosswalk, which is the 24-inch wide solid line with 12 inches, curb-to-curb, and work with Jim and his department to find the most economical way to accomplish that.

Chairman Osborne asked so where should the Type I's be? Just on Elm Street? Where are you talking?

Alderman Roy responded city-wide

Chairman Osborne asked city-wide?

Alderman Roy stated city-wide, so there's not a determination between Massabesic Street and Cedar Street and Auburn Street. It's the same thing city-wide.

Chairman Osborne stated I think we'd better start somewhere first, walk before we run here with that one. That's a lot of money. That's a lot of labor. How are they going to get around to these?

Alderman Roy stated I just look at this...It doesn't matter if a child gets hit on a quiet residential street. We just added a stop sign on Sunset Lane in Alderman Pinard's Ward, compared to traffic on South Willow and Elm Street. It's not going to matter when it comes to safety if a child gets hit.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think I read this wrong to begin with, and now I understand it. Take, for example, the crosswalk at Hunt Pool on Maple Street. That would be a Type I crosswalk. Whereas, Elm and Hanover would be a Type II crosswalk.

Mr. Hoben stated we were going to make all Type I's in the downtown area.

Alderman O'Neil stated okay, give me an example, Jim, of where would be a Type II. Wilson and Valley? Or is that considered a school zone, that crossing?

Mr. Hoben responded that would be a school zone.

Alderman O'Neil stated give me one that is a controlled intersection that we would do the...

Mr. Hoben stated Pine and Orange. We could use a Type I on Pine and on the side street to Orange, use the Type II. Where it's controlled, we have to stop at a stop sign.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's not what this says. It says Type II shall be installed on streets that are not supervised by a traffic control device.

Mr. Hoben stated right. A stop sign or a signal. Those unsupervised would be a Type I.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess I...although I don't want to...you know, we're going to...I agree with Alderman's Osborne's point about school zones, playground zones, or senior citizen zones, and that those should be Type I. Whether there is a control device or not, they should be Type I's. I guess I have a concern with...and I agree with Alderman Roy about...then we get into this real inconsistency

Chairman Osborne stated.well, it's a good pilot program anyway.

Alderman Shea stated we're talking about the difference in cost; what are we talking about here? How much difference is there by Type I and Type II as far as the expense?

Mr. Hoben replied you're using three to four times more the paint.

Alderman Shea asked but is that all?

Chairman Osborne responded it's three or four times the labor, unless you get those new line...

Alderman Shea stated well, I say, if you do it right the first time, you don't have to do it right the second time, so I agree with Alderman Roy that we should have consistency throughout the City. We have so many different types of patchwork. I don't care what it costs. The people that walk on streets are just as important in one part of the City as they are in the other part of the City. The downtown in Manchester is no more important than streets in Wards 5,7,9,11, and 12. So I say, if you're going to do it at all, do it the same way. I don't care if you use extra labor or extra paint. Let's do it the right way and do it as we should do it. So, if Mr. Roy wants to make a motion to that regard, I'll second it.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman, just a point...

Chairman Osborne stated let me just say one thing: I think we'd better triple our money to the Highway Department here I guess.

Alderman O'Neil stated the labor is already paid for, so there's no cost for the labor. I mean, we do have an issue whether or not two people get laid off. But the labor...their manpower is their manpower, whether they're painting Type I or Type II.

Chairman Osborne stated yes, but it takes them longer to do that, with the machines they have now...

Alderman O'Neil stated we can't say there's an additional labor cost. The labor is already paid for.

Chairman Osborne asked are they going to get around the whole City doing this? This is the whole thing. How can you do the whole City? They'd never get to the lines in the roads. You know where I'm coming from. It takes time to do that.

Alderman O'Neil stated if there's a little more cost for paint, I'm in favor of it.

Chairman Osborne stated good, let's get some money over there.

Alderman Roy stated well I agree with the Chairman that adding dollars for safety is necessary.

Chairman Osborne stated I have no problem with it.

Alderman Roy stated two quick things and I'll put an end to this: The first would be to receive and file this discussion.

Alderman Shea stated I'll second it.

Alderman Roy stated then I have a follow-up after that vote.

There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Roy stated and then as a request of Jim: Could you give us the cost that you spend yearly on paint, the amount of hours that go into the manpower...last year, just use last year as your base example...and any equipment cost that is out there that would make this more efficient?

Mr. Hoben stated we've already identified that. It was...

Alderman Roy stated we were told it was going to become part of the budget process, which it has not. So if you could bring that to us by mail as soon as possible through the courier, it would be greatly appreciated. What you spent on paint last year and the year before, what you spend on manpower last year and the year before, and what equipment you would need to make this more efficient. And you may be able to see that happen for you.

Chairman Osborne stated Jim, can I ask you a question? Do you have time every year to finish all the lines out there, the way it is right now?

Mr. Hoben responded no we don't.

Chairman Osborne stated so they need more manpower than what they have right now. That's without even getting rid of the two bodies that they were talking about. They're going to need a couple more to do all those lines throughout the City. So are you willing to up their...Don't get me wrong. I'm number one for that, but I'm just...you know, the budget...I don't think the Mayor likes listening to this.

Alderman Long stated Jim, could we get a pricing on colored paint also? I agree. I'd just like to see the price – blue or yellow or whatever they use. I mean, if we're going to invest in this, it seems to me other cities get a lot more respect with different colors. A white line is a white line, whether it's a median down the middle of the road, or what have you. But if we could get a yellow or a blue or whatever the State allows...

Chairman Osborne stated orange, a nice orange.

Alderman Long stated whatever the State would allow. You could see that coming ten feet away or what have you, and then you know there's a crosswalk.

Chairman Osborne stated fluorescent orange, perfect,

Mr. Hoben stated we purchased some red for the Millyard last year, the brick red, and I believe it was four times the cost of the normal paint.

Alderman Shea asked you purchased red for the Millyard?

Mr. Hoben responded we redid the red brick-colored crosswalks on Commercial Street.

Alderman Shea asked did you purchase it for any other part of the City?

Mr. Hoben responded that was the only purchase for that.

Alderman Shea asked and it cost four times as much?

Mr. Hoben replied four times as much as the standard white.

Alderman O'Neil stated I can tell you this, the paint that the St. Patrick's parade uses is cheap, and it stays down year round, so I don't know that we necessarily have to be buying real expensive paint.

Chairman Osborne stated you can't see it though, that green. It's hard to see on the streets.

Alderman O'Neil stated well not that specific color, but...

Chairman Osborne stated we need fluorescent orange. Anyways, just one more question, Mr. Hoben: If we're going to be spending all this kind of money, we do need the new stripers, right? So you have to go make one pass instead of four or three passes on one line.

Mr. Hoben stated right.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Roy, are you listening? He's going to need more money for those stripers, if we're going to go the whole City. No problem?

Alderman Roy responded if he gets the report that I asked him to, he'd be surprised. We'll find something for him.

Chairman Osborne stated that's fine.

Alderman Roy stated safety doesn't end with police. It goes to crosswalks, solid waste compliance officers and other things.

There being no opposition to the motion of Alderman Roy to receive and file this discussion, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne stated I guess we're going to go to the tabled items real quickly.

Alderman Shea stated all right, #14 I'd like to take off.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'll second his motion.

Chairman Osborne stated wait a minute. First of all, start with #11. Mr. Duval wanted me to take this off and to see if we could go along with what's here.

11. **STOP SIGNS:**

On Lacourse Street at Rhode Island Avenue, NEC
On New York Street at Rhode Island Avenue, SWC
Alderman Duval
(Tabled 05/16/2006)

Alderman Shea stated he wants it to be tabled and then what does he want?

Chairman Osborne stated we're taking it off the table.

Deputy City Clerk Carol Johnson stated you need a motion to remove it.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove #11 from the table.

Chairman Osborne stated Mr. Duval, we're on your signs up here on Lacourse and New York; It's mainly just Rhode Island Avenue we're talking about.

Alderman Duval stated yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman. Again, we continue to get complaints on this street...

Chairman Osborne stated they're not four-ways, now. Okay?

Alderman Duval stated they're not four-ways, no. And again, Rhode Island Street is a challenge; it's very narrow, very hilly. Rather unusual circumstance. And this is one small way of responding to residents' concerns about but the cut-through, but most importantly the speed of vehicles that use it as a cut-through street.

Chairman Osborne stated basically I don't see any problem with it. I mean, this is the Alderman. He wants this in his Ward. It's not a four-way stop sign. It's just breaking up Rhode Island Avenue where they cut off of Hanover Street to go to Bridge Street Extension. And while they're doing that, they're going as fast as they can because they want to get to the other end, to Bridge Street Extension. I know you're trying to slow down traffic, you're going to bring that up, but I think in this situation here it's not a bad idea, for safety, anyway.

Alderman Shea made a motion to accept the stop signs. It was duly seconded by Alderman Long.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have always taken the position, you don't use stop signs to control speed. That's a poor use of stop signs. It's an enforcement issue. If police need to be out there writing more tickets, that's what they need to be doing. You talk to the people who have speed bumps down on Donohue and Sherwood

and that, they will tell you, after those speed bumps went in, all that happens is they speed between the speed bumps. That's all that's going to happen here is they're going to speed between the stop signs. This is a poor use of a stop sign. It's an enforcement issue. Police need to write tickets on Rhode Island Avenue. Plain and simple.

Chairman Osborne stated I agree with you, Mr. O'Neil, but I think the Police Department just don't have the time to be up there all the time.

Alderman O'Neil stated well, you know, they've got to start making some time to get to some of these places.

Alderman Shea's motion to accept the stop signs was approved. Aldermen O'Neil and Roy were opposed.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked you're voting yes, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Osborne responded yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated it's a poor excuse, the police can't get there to write tickets. It's a poor excuse.

14. Communication from Joe Morse submitting recommendations to help alleviate the dangerous situation at the intersection of Valley and Massabesic Streets and Tarrytown Road.
(Tabled 01/30/2007 pending review by Police Traffic Division)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to take #14 off the table.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to receive and file these recommendations.

TABLED ITEMS

12. Communication from Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Commission recommending naming the Manchester Recreational Trail system inclusive of Manchester City limits present and future, in honor of Officer Briggs to be called "The Michael L. Briggs Trail System 83."
(Tabled 11/14/2006)
This item remained on the table.

13. Communication from Alderman Shea proposing the establishment of a Manchester Crime Prevention Committee.

(Tabled 12/12/2006)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee